



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,118	08/28/2000	JHEROEN P. DORENBOSCH	PF2054NA	9447
20280	7590	08/26/2004	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA INC 600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 ROOM AS437 LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2683	

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/650,118

Applicant(s)

DORENBOSCH ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen M. D'Agosta

Art Unit

2683

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-11 and 13-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments presented do not sway the examiner. 1) The applicant argues that the prior art does not teach first/second classes of service for users. The examiner disagrees since Iseyama teaches a plurality of communication devices that include at least one first communication device subscribed to a first class of service and at least one second communication device subscribed to a second class of service (col.1, lines 53-67*, col.2, lines 1-15*, col.3, lines 1-25). The combination of Davidson's subscriber information download and Iseyama's classes of service provides for one skilled in the art to determine which classes of service would be supported while others have service dropped due to the network failure (ref. Iseyama col.1, lines 44-57*, col.3, lines 49-65). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the teachings of Davidson with Iseyama in order to efficiently provide a cost-effective uninterrupted backup wireless communication system with a first class service and a second class service. 2. The applicant argues that the prior art does not teach terminating services based on a database. The examiner again disagrees since Davidson teaches a communication system and backup services which supports the main if service goes out and a database subscription for first/second/etc. devices and subscriber information being downgraded based on a particular device needing service while Iseyama teaches multiple communication devices and classes of service. As stated by the examiner, Iseyama's "class of service" concept is well known as providing service to those with higher priority and hence would only support those users (during an outage) with the higher/highest priorities which, when combined with Davidson, reads on the claim. The interpretation of the HLR/VLR database is appropriate since affecting the user's ability to transmit/receive will affect the HLR/VLR databases.

The examiner does believe that amending claim 1 with claims 3, 4 and 7 may result in a more favorable outcome.



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600